

Executive Registry

62-2559

21 APR 1962

AGENCY POLICY ON SURPLUS PERSONNEL

ILLEGIB

The Purpose of the discussion is to review the Agency program for retiring surplus personnel, with particular reference to the exercise currently in progress in the INSP area, to determine whether any exceptions should be made in view of recent developments.

The Background: The Agency entered the surplus personnel program only after the most careful study and coordination. The principal objective was to eliminate a "hump" in the clandestine services which was stagnating promotions. The Agency received approval from the Bureau of the Budget, Civil Service Commission and House Appropriations Committee to give severance pay to those personnel whose specialities were peculiar to the Agency. The Agency prepared retention lists ranking personnel in comparable categories in order of value, using panels of senior officers to perform this chore. Those declared surplus are at the bottom of these retention lists.

The Issues: There are NO questions about:

1. The need for the Agency, particularly the clandestine services, to get rid of a hump in certain grades.
2. The fact that the procedures for solution of the surplus personnel were about as just and equitable as could humanly be devised.
3. The fact that the majority of those declared surplus should leave the Agency if there are no jobs which they can competently perform at their present or lower grades.

There ARE questions about:

1. Whether exceptions shouldn't be made on an individual basis in those cases where:
 - (a) an individual was recruited from a good job in industry, persuaded to stay on as a careerist, and is now, in his mid-fifties, being released;

MORI/CDF

- (b) an individual who transferred to the DDF from the DEM, who has exceptional language ability, and after 10 years, is now surplus;
- (c) individuals in their fifties who will have difficulties finding employment, and who have little or no annuities, who could possibly be used on a contract basis;
- (d) individuals who could possibly be used in the expansion of the Division; (are we not in an ambivalent position declaring personnel surplus while simultaneously recruiting)
- (e) individuals who could be used in the expanded, PM, counter-insurgency efforts.

Commentary: Having said all of the above I would add the following comments:

1. It is unfortunate that some personnel who should have been "selected out" were put in the surplus personnel category--it serves to discredit the others. And the fact that the same officer in personnel who handles the "selection out" cases also handles these, has not helped.
2. It is unfortunate that a number of detailees--clandestine service personnel detailed to other offices--were on the list: this will create problems in the future.
3. It is also true that quite a few of these people should have been let go over the years as the quality of their performance decreased.

15/

WILLIAM B. KIRKPATRICK, JR.
Executive Director